

### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in view of the above amendments and following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. By this amendment, Claims 1-3 and 7 are amended; and no claims are added or canceled herewith. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found at least at page 6, lines 15-23 and page 17 line 17 of the present specification. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added by this amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; Claims 1, 5-7 and 9-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,397,634 to Takeda; and Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,226,942 to Letemps.

The applied art does not teach or suggest moving horizontally one or more of the plurality of rollers when the one or more rollers is in contact with the glass plate in conveyance, as recited in Claim 1 and similarly recited in Claim 7.

Instead, Takeda discloses that as shown in Figures 1-3, the roller conveyor 20 includes a plurality of straight rollers 20A-20M arranged in a horizontal state in the transferring direction of the glass plate. The rollers are parallel to each other. The glass plate 18 is transferred with the rotation of the rollers 20A-20M along a transferring plane formed by these rollers. The rollers 20A-20M are driven to rotate independently by each rotating-driving means and are moved vertically independently by means of each vertical direction driving means. The rotating/driving means and vertical direction driving means are controlled by a motion controller. Thus, Takeda discloses that the rollers are vertically moved but does not teach or suggest that the rollers are horizontally moved.

Letemps discloses, as best shown in Figure 2, the curving tool which is composed of a portion of the conveyor defining a shaping bed curved in the direction of travel of the glass

sheet. Portion 17 of the conveyor is realigned relative to the direction followed by the glass sheet 18 in proximity to the exit from the furnace 19. The orientation affects only the portion 17 as there is no reason to reorient the second cooling conveyor 20. It is the object of Letemps to have the curving machine repositioned appropriately for each glass sheet rather than the glass sheets being centered relative to the curving machine. Thus, it is the complete portion 17 of the conveyor which is realigned to move the glass sheet. Again, the features of the independent claims are not shown in the applied art. Claims 1 and 7 similarly recite moving horizontally one or more of the plurality of rollers when the one or more rollers is in contact with the glass plate in conveyance. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under § 102(b) as anticipated by Takeda and Letemps is respectfully requested.

Consequently, for the reasons discussed in detail above, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

GJM:KMM\dt

I:\ATTY\KMM\PROSECUTION WORK\239266\239266US-RR.DOC

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gregory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 25,599

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kevin M. McKinley  
Registration No. 43,794

Robert T. Pous  
Registration No. 29,099